



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Already the book has been most favorably noticed by the best authorities of Europe. Professor Carl Vogt, for instance, who certainly never indulges in praise where praise is not due, calls the volume in question "a work splendid in appearance and rich in contents, that must be classed with the best of its kind produced in our time."

3.—*Essays, Philological and Critical, selected from the Papers of*
JAMES HADLEY, LL. D. New York: Holt and Williams. 1873.

THE volume of Professor Hadley's Essays seems fully to justify the strong expressions of praise and regard in the Preface of his friend, Professor Whitney. These specimens show an exact and wide learning, a nice sense of truth, and an enthusiastic and genial spirit. Evidently, Professor Hadley was no mere pedantic classicist, devoted to writing poor poetry in dead languages, or even satisfied with a narrow range of microscopic verbal criticisms. He was a student of language with wide views, in accord with the most advanced modern notions of philological study, and had paid attention to Sanskrit and the comparative grammar of the Indo-European languages. The publication of his views on these subjects is very timely, when the leading journal of the country, the supposed exponent of high scholarship, often contains a covert sneer at comparative philology. Professor Hadley is a worthy example, to the classical students of this country, of the judicious combination of exact classical knowledge with a wide range of linguistic investigation. He was not, perhaps, an original authority in these matters, like his friend Professor Whitney, but he was always an intelligent critic of the labors of the most advanced pioneers. For, from the cast of his mind, he seems to have been rather a critic than an original investigator, and these pages show less original genius than perhaps might be expected in so inspiring a branch of study as philology. Still, we have not so much originality in this field, in this country, that we can afford to despise the remarkable excellence of Professor Hadley.

A little less than a third of the book treats of purely Greek subjects, though even here are traces of wider studies.

The first article, on the "Ionian Migrations," deals with Dr. E. Curtius's theory of the early settlement of Ionians on the eastern shore of the Ægean, before the migration from Greece proper. From the nature of the subject the criticism is not decisive, but it throws the weight of the author's opinions against the theory, and is as good a statement of the arguments as can be found.

The second reviews Bekker's digammated Homer.

The fifth is more valuable, and contains a summary, with occasional criticism, of the doctrines of Greek rhythm and metre, as derived by Westphal and Rossbach from the more careful study of Greek musicians. This learning, which is exceedingly unintelligible in the German, Professor Hadley has put in a very plain and readable form, — a task for which he seems to have been very well qualified by having a nice ear and some knowledge of music, two things absolutely necessary for any real understanding of Greek metres.

The fifth will be to most persons, we think, the best of the whole, and has a real and permanent value. It is a very thorough and able treatise on the whole nature and theory of the ancient accent.

The leading idea is that the effects in Greek and Latin, which we call accent, were *melodic*, consisting in pitch, not *dynamic*, consisting in stress. This idea is ably set forth and supported by convincing argument. To this is added a less certain theory that the Greek had an inherited, intermediate tone, between the acute and unaccented syllable. Upon this theory the position of the Greek and Latin accent is ably explained. It is probable that these doctrines are true of Greek, but they can hardly be true of Latin, — in the historical period, at least. Certainly no mere melodic accent could have played such havoc with words, and especially with final syllables, as was made in Latin before the language becomes known to us. Probably the Latin began early to substitute stress for its old inherited pitch accent, but this tendency was somewhat checked by the cultivation of Greek forms of metre.

The seventh is an interesting essay on Greek pronunciation in the tenth century, which throws light on the earlier pronunciation also.

The next division of the book consists of articles on more general topics of philology, and occupies a little more than a third of the whole. Of these, number eight is of a kind that is now somewhat rare, because, fortunately, the necessity has passed away. When published, in 1858, it was, no doubt, very timely, and might still be read by many with profit.

It is a review of a reactionary book which attempted to stop the progress of linguistic science, and decry Sanskrit studies; a book somewhat like that of Professor Key, which was thoroughly reviewed by Professor Whitney in his last volume of Essays. The antidote is well administered, and we commend this article to all school committees, teachers, and book-makers who think comparative philology is outgrown in Germany, or indeed anywhere.

Number two, though treating of a Greek etymology, seems to belong in this part of the book. It attempts to connect *θεοπρόπος* with the root *prak*, which appears in Lat. *precor*, Sk. *prach*, and German *fragen*. It does not seem successful, though we have not ourselves anything better

to offer. Number three, also, is on a Greek subject, — the origin of the ablative functions of the Greek genitive; but the treatment is in the style of comparative grammar. It is well done, and has the true scientific method. Numbers nine, ten, and eleven are also upon topics of comparative grammar, the Indo-European aspirates, the future tense, and passive voice, respectively. They are all excellent summaries of the views held by scholars on these subjects, accompanied by learned and sharp-sighted criticism. They are well worthy of preservation, though they are superseded in some details by later investigations. Number twelve, on the Latin subjunctive, though containing some valuable hints, seems to us the least worthy in the volume, especially in view of its date (1870). The author seems not entirely emancipated from the metaphysical method of grammar, and the result seems unsatisfactory on account of a wrong fundamental conception. Starting from the well-established formal origin of the Indo-European optative, from some form of the root *i*, the author supposes the form to have originally expressed a wish. This view, we think, is wrong. The meaning of *wish* is rare in any form of this root, and confined to Sanskrit, so there is no ground for believing the meaning original Indo-European. Nor, again, is there any reason to suppose this meaning in order to account for the meanings of the mood. Says Professor Hadley: "The Latin subjunctive is used to express an action as desired or wished for." Hence, a root to *wish* is the most natural factor of the mood. But, in fact, this is true only of a desiderative, where the wish is in all cases the wish of the subject. In the subjunctive (optative) the wish is not that of the subject, and cannot be so, except in the first person. It is impossible to trace the meaning of the expression *di meliora duint* from any form of wishing, on the part of the gods. It is possible, of course, that wishing might fade out into mere futurity, as in our own future with *will*, and through that develop modal meanings. But this requires an unnecessary step, for the idea of *going*, the original meaning of the root *i*, yields such a future at once. The potential subjunctive is made by Professor Hadley to grow out of the subjunctive of result, — an obvious error. The potential uses are among the most primitive of all, while those of result are later, and confined to Latin.

Number thirteen treats of the old question, the origin of the English possessive case, maintaining forcibly the prevalent view that the *s* is original, and not a corruption of *his*. Number fourteen is an excellent review of Ellis's *Early English Pronunciation*, already published in this Review, Vol. CX., 1870.

Number fifteen, on "English Vowel Quantity," is to us the best in the volume, though not of so general interest. The accented system of

poetry has become so firmly established, in English especially, that we have almost ceased to think of quantity as belonging to vowels at all. We see this disregard of quantity in the many bad hexameters we have. Perhaps it would not be possible, with the remnants of quantity that we have, to make perfect rhythmical verses; yet when obviously long syllables are used as short, in a dactyl, the jar is perceptible, though most persons do not stop to think of the cause. Professor Hadley recognizes natural quantity as still existing in modern English, and compares it with that of the thirteenth century, which is indicated by the peculiar spelling of the *Ormulum*. The general result is, that with some regular exceptions, which follow fixed principles, the quantity has remained the same. The comparison is very carefully made, and the essay is quite German in its minuteness and thoroughness. He does not recognize quantity by position. But to our ear the word *strength* is a long syllable, on account of the combination of consonants, though the vowel is short. If the author's conclusions are correct, it is unfortunate that we have allowed our sense of rhythm to become so obtuse as to lose rhythmic poetry almost entirely, and even to give the language a harsh, unmusical flow.

The remaining third of the volume is of a more popular magazine style, and we cannot help wishing, from our own point of view, that they had been published in another volume. As a memorial for circulation among the friends of Professor Hadley, it is a more complete picture of his literary activity; but, on the other hand, few persons who buy the book for what there is in it will want to read this last third. It seems a pity, therefore, as the price of the book is rather large at any rate (four dollars), that the first two thirds cannot be purchased without the necessity of paying for memorial literature. Of course, no one knows this better than Professor Whitney, and undoubtedly he felt compelled by sufficiently strong reasons, under the peculiar circumstances of the case, to publish in this form, which probably on the whole is best. The mechanical execution of the book is remarkably good, and the whole is creditable alike to American scholarship and American skill.

-
- 4.—*A new variorum Edition of Shakespeare*. Edited by HORACE HOWARD FURNESS. Vol. II., *Macbeth*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1873.

THIS work can hardly fail to mark a most important era in Shakespearean literature; that, too, not only for the American people, but for the whole English-speaking world, if, indeed, its importance is to be bounded by any circumscriptions of language. It is now fifty-two